

1 WO  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 MICHAEL C. BAUERLEIN, surviving  
9 natural father of BROOKE LYNNE  
BAUERLEIN, deceased minor,  
10 individually and on behalf of all wrongful  
death beneficiaries, including SHANNON  
11 BAUERLEIN, surviving mother of  
BROOKE LYNNE BAUERLEIN,  
12 deceased minor; and PATRICIA JOELEE  
BAUERLEIN, through MICHEAL C.  
13 BAUERLEIN, her natural parent and  
next friend,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 EQUITY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES  
17 MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, an  
Illinois Corporation d/b/a LA  
18 MARIPOSA; LOTUS & WINDOWARE,  
INC., a California Corporation; JUMBO  
19 SURPLUS CORPORATION, a  
Taiwanese Corporation; JOHN and JANE  
20 DOES I-X; and BLACK and WHITE  
CORPORATIONS/ PARTNERSHIPS I-  
21 X,

22 Defendants.

23 NO. CV04-1904-PHX-SMM

24 **ORDER**

25  
26 Pending before the Court is Defendant/Cross-Defendant/Cross-Claimant Jumbo  
Surplus Corporation's ("Jumbo") Motion for Leave to Amend its Affirmative Defenses

1 (Doc. 190). Jumbo seeks to amend its Amended Answer to the Second Amended  
 2 Complaint and Affirmative Defenses to add the following affirmative defenses:  
 3

- 4 **25. As an affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that this Court does not**  
**have personal jurisdiction over Jumbo.**
- 5 **29. As an affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that it is not liable to the**  
**Plaintiffs in this matter as Jumbo's manner of work with regard to the**  
**subject product was done strictly in compliance with specifications**  
**provided by other entities and by this following of specifications,**  
**Jumbo is not liable to Plaintiffs.**
- 6 **30. As an affirmative defense, Defendant alleges, pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-**  
**551 and all applicable or related statutes of repose and limitation, that**  
**Plaintiffs' action is barred by the statute of limitations.**

7  
 10 Proposed Second Amended Answer (Doc. 190-2).

11 On July 7, 2005, Plaintiff was granted leave to file its Second Amended  
 12 Complaint in this action wherein Plaintiff named Jumbo as a Defendant, among other  
 13 Defendants in the wrongful death claim of Brooke Bauerlein. According to the record,  
 14 Plaintiff first attempted service on Jumbo pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P.4, however Jumbo did  
 15 not voluntarily appear.<sup>1</sup> Thereafter, on December 8, 2006, after obtaining international  
 16 service on Jumbo, Jumbo filed its Answer and affirmative defenses. (Doc. 160).  
 17 Jumbo's Answer did not raise the defense of lack of personal jurisdiction. Nor did  
 18 Jumbo raise the defense of lack of personal jurisdiction at that time by filing a motion  
 19 pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P.12. (Doc. 160). On December 20, Jumbo filed an Amended  
 20 Answer without Motion for Leave. Once again, Jumbo did not raise the defense of lack  
 21 of personal jurisdiction. (Doc. 165). On March 27, more than three months subsequent  
 22 to filing its Amended Answer, Jumbo filed the pending motion seeking leave to amend  
 23

---

24  
 25 to filing its Amended Answer, Jumbo filed the pending motion seeking leave to amend  
 26  
<sup>1</sup> A copy of the letter and proof of receipt is included in the record.

1 its Answer. An objection to personal jurisdiction must be raised as an affirmative  
2 defense in the Answer or by motion prior to the filing of the Answer.  
3 Fed.R.Civ.P.12(b). Consequently, permitting Jumbo to amend its Answer to add the  
4 affirmative defense of lack of personal jurisdiction when Jumbo failed to raise the  
5 defense in a pre-Answer motion or its first responsive pleading, would contravene the  
6 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and effectively render Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(h) as it relates  
7 to personal jurisdiction meaningless.<sup>2</sup>  
8

9  
10 Therefore, Jumbo's Motion for Leave to Amend (Doc. 190) as it pertains to the  
11 affirmative defense of lack of personal jurisdiction (paragraph 25) is **DENIED**.

12 As to Jumbo's request to add affirmative defenses paragraphs 29 and 30, the Court  
13 finds no objection with this request. Rule 15(a) provides that "leave will be freely given  
14 when justice requires". In its opposition, Plaintiff raised no objection with regard to  
15 Jumbo's proposed affirmative defenses paragraphs 29 and 30. Therefore, the Court finds  
16 that justice requires the Court to **GRANT** Jumbo's Motion for Leave to Amend (Doc.  
17 190) as it pertains to paragraphs 29 and 30.  
18  
19

20 Accordingly,

21 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Jumbo's Motion for Leave to Amend its

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 <sup>2</sup> Furthermore, the Court finds that Jumbo waived the defense of lack of personal  
24 jurisdiction by making an appearance in the case. Defendants can waive the defect of  
25 lack of personal jurisdiction by appearing generally without first challenging the defect  
26 in a preliminary motion. *Jackson v. Hayakawa*, 682 F.2d 1344, 1347 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
1982)(citing *Amen v. Dearborn*, 532 F.2d 554, 558, n.7 (6th Cir. 1976))(Jurisdiction  
attaches if a defendant makes a voluntary general appearance, as by filing an answer  
through an attorney).

1 Affirmative Defenses (Doc. 190) is **DENIED** in part and **GRANTED** in part.

2 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED GRANTING** Jumbo's Motion for Leave to  
3 Amend its Affirmative Defenses (Doc. 190) as to paragraphs 29 and 30 of Jumbo's  
4 proposed Second Amended Answer to Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Doc.  
5 190-2).

6 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED DENYING** Jumbo's Motion for Leave to Amend  
7 its Affirmative Defenses (Doc. 190) as to paragraph 25 of Jumbo's proposed Second  
8 Amended Answer to Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Doc. 190-2).

9  
10 DATED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2007.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16   
17 Stephen M. McNamee  
18 United States District Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26